

IN THE CLAIMS

In claim 98, line 7, delete "the surface of".

REMARKS

Claims 92-95, and 97-116 are in the application. A Terminal Disclaimer is enclosed responsive to the double patenting rejection of paragraphs 8-9 of the Office Action. A check in the amount of \$110.00 is enclosed for Terminal Disclaimer Fee. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

Turning to the § 102 rejections, Lampert et al. does not disclose contacting an article with a heated oxidizing solution, as claimed. Rather, Lampert et al. teaches spraying a mist of pure water into a processing system at a temperature between 10° C and 90° C (col. 2, lines 33-34). The water mist is not a solution. It is a mist of pure water that interacts with a gas to form a chemically active substance, which removes contaminating particles from the wafer (col. 2, lines 52-55; col. 4, lines 59-64). In Lampert et al., the use of a mist, or finely divided water, is apparently essential, to allow the gas to react with the water. Col. 2, lines 52-55. In contrast, in the claimed invention, a solution or liquid is applied to the workpiece. However, with use of such a mist or fog, uniform processing is difficult or impossible to achieve because the mist cannot be made uniform throughout the chamber. See, e.g., Ohmi et al. '398, Col. 4, lines 60-63.

Additionally, with respect to claim 92 while rotation of wafers is briefly mentioned in Lampert et al. (col. 4, lines 3-4), Lampert et al. does not teach rotating a wafer with a heated liquid solution on its surface. Lampert et al. simply states that "facilities may also be provided to agitate the wafers in the working position, for example by rotation" (col. 4, lines 3-4). Lampert et al. does not mention any specific details on how and when its rotation process occurs.